

1 and not tie ourselves to another imported fossil fuel, over
2 which we will have little control and which, we have learned
3 the hard way, is highly susceptible to market manipulation
4 and questionable, if not outright, at times, illegal market
5 tactics.

6 So while the jury is still out, the judges seem to
7 be rushing us to the LNG altar and the first one down the
8 aisle is the massive BHP Billiton floating storage and
9 regasification unit, a mooring facility the size of three
10 football fields, to be anchored 14 miles off our coast.

11 To see the determination, within this document, to
12 provide no other real alternative, but this one, is to
13 literally ignore any other locations, but one closer to
14 shore, to reject all other technologies, to negate all other
15 outstanding LNG proposals, and to dismiss any combined
16 conservation and renewable efforts is to posit this proposal
17 as the only answer. But of course, we know it's not,
18 nothing like this exists anywhere else.

19 And I would like to quickly address earlier
20 comments made by John Olsen, representing the Australian
21 government. It was on a trip there this summer, and
22 numerous meetings with Australian officials, including
23 Minister MacFarlane, that I cautioned them to carefully
24 distinguish their country as a supplier of LNG from the
25 unproven and untested technology being recommended by BHP

T005-34.2
(cont'd)

T005-34.3

Sections 1.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3.1, 3.3.2, 3.3.3, 4.10, and 4.10.1.3 contain information on the range of alternatives evaluated. Under NEPA and the CEQA, a reasonable range of alternatives must be considered. NEPA requires consideration of a "reasonable" number of alternatives. In determining the scope of alternatives, the emphasis is on "reasonable." "Reasonable" alternatives include those that are practical and feasible from the technical and economic standpoint and using common sense (CEQ 40 Questions; #2a).

The information must be sufficient to enable reviewers and decision-makers to evaluate and compare alternatives. The State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(a) provides, in part, "An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project."

The EIS/EIR initially evaluated 18 locations for the FSRU as potential locations for the deepwater port. It built on previous California Coastal Commission studies that evaluated nearly 100 locations. Sections 3.3.7 and 3.3.9 discuss alternate locations and technologies that were considered.

T005-34.4

Sections 2.1 and 4.2.7.3 contain information on design criteria and specifications, final design requirements, and regulations governing the construction of the FSRU and LNG carriers.

T005-34.4

1 Billiton.

2 California needs a deliberative public process.
3 It needs to take the reins from the heavy hands of the
4 federal government, and figure out how much we need, where
5 facilities, if we need LNG, should be located, what
6 technology should be used, and what scale they should be.

7 This is our process, we need to have control of
8 it. Thank you.

9 (Applause.)

10 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Luis Montoya.

11 MR. MONTOYA: Hi, my name's Luis Montoya, and I'm
12 a student intern with the Environmental Defense Center.

13 The DAR states that the Cabrillo Port LNG Terminal
14 will supply California with 800 million cubic feet of
15 natural gas per day. It also forecasts that California will
16 demand 2.4 trillion cubic feet per day, or 6,575 million
17 cubic feet per day, by the year 2013.

18 This means that by 2013, Cabrillo Port will be
19 supplying 12 percent of the natural gas used in the State of
20 California.

21 I found a study, conducted by the American Council
22 for an Energy-Efficient Economy, that proves that California
23 can reduce its demand for natural gas by more than 15
24 percent within the next five years, through efficiency and
25 consumption reduction techniques.

T005-34.5

T005-34.5

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

T005-35.1

Sections 1.2.2, 1.2.3, 1.2.4, 3.3.1, 3.3.2, and 4.10.1.3 contain information on the need for natural gas, the role and status of energy conservation and renewable energy sources, and the California Energy Action Plan.

COMMENTS
T005-35

T005-35.1

1 For example, by reducing natural gas consumption
2 in the commercial sector, California can save 5.1 percent
3 off its current gas use by 2009.

4 Similarly, 4.8 percent can be saved through
5 efficiency and demand reduction in the residential sector.

6 California's industrial sector has the most
7 potential for improvement in that it can reduce it's natural
8 gas use by 5.2 percent within the next five years.

9 By implementing more efficient technologies in
10 these three sectors, alone, California can save a total of
11 15.3 percent off its current gas demand.

12 We would, therefore, save more in this manner than
13 Cabrillo Port would supply.

14 These estimates of natural gas savings are based
15 on available technologies and feasible practices.

16 My research has further revealed that a large
17 quantity of natural gas can additionally be saved by
18 refurbishing some of California's oldest, least efficient,
19 electric power plants.

20 If we replaced the least efficient, non-peaking
21 power plants with combined cycled turbines, that are used at
22 newer facilities in California, we would save 174 billion
23 cubic feet per year of natural gas, than we use at present.

24 This is equivalent to approximately 70 percent of
25 the natural gas to be supplied by Cabrillo Port.

T005-35.1
(cont'd)

T005-35.2

Section 3.3.3 discusses why retrofitting existing power plants with more efficient natural gas turbines is not a feasible alternative to the proposed Project.

T005-35.2

1 My purpose here is to illustrate that the project
 2 alternatives are not given enough consideration in the DAR.
 3 More efficient use of natural gas would reduce demand to the
 4 point that the Cabrillo Port project would no longer be
 5 necessary.

T005-35.3

T005-35.3

Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 address conservation and renewable energy sources, within the context of the California Energy Commission's 2005 Integrated Energy Report and other State and Federal energy reports, as alternatives to replace additional supplies of natural gas.

6 We must not increase our dependence on this
 7 foreign-based fossil fuel source. We must, instead, take
 8 action to reduce demand for natural gas and move California
 9 towards a more sustainable energy independence.

T005-35.4

T005-35.4

Section 1.2 discusses dependence on foreign energy sources.

10 Thank you.

11 (Applause.)

12 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Alicia Finigan.

COMMENTER
T005-36

13 MS. FINIGAN: Hi, my name is Alicia Finigan, and
 14 I'm an attorney for the Environmental Defense Center, a
 15 nonprofit, public interest law firm in Santa Barbara. I'm
 16 testifying, today, on behalf of the California Coastal
 17 Protection Network.

18 My comments, today, will focus on our belief that
 19 the safety analysis in the draft EIS is inadequate and
 20 requires additional information and further analysis, thus
 21 providing a compelling basis for the agencies to suspend the
 22 Deepwater Port Act timeline to allow for complete and
 23 accurate environmental review.

T005-36.1

24 It is critical that the safety, risk, and
 25 consequence analysis in the Cabrillo Port LNG EIS be both

T005-36.1

All deepwater port applications fall under the authority of the Deepwater Port Act, which requires that a decision on the application be made within 330 days of the publication of the Notice of Application in the Federal Register. The Notice of Application for the Cabrillo Port Project was published in the Federal Register on January 27, 2004. Although the comment period (53 days) could not be extended at that time, a March 2006 Revised Draft EIR was recirculated under the CEQA for an additional public review period of 60 days. Section 1.4.1 contains additional information on this topic.

Section 1.5 contains information on opportunities for public comment. After the MARAD final license hearing, the public will have 45 days to comment on the Final EIS/EIR and the license application. The Federal and State agencies will have an additional 45 days to provide comments to the MARAD Administrator. The Administrator must issue the Record of Decision within 90 days after the final license hearing. The CSLC will hold a hearing to certify the EIR and make the decision whether to grant a lease. The California Coastal Commission will also hold a hearing. Comments received will be evaluated before any final decision is made regarding the proposed Project.

1 comprehensive and accurate, since a facility, such as this,
2 has never before been constructed anywhere else in the
3 world, and future proposals will be looking at this document
4 for guidance.

T005-36.2

T005-36.2

Sections 2.1 and 4.2.7.3 contain information on design criteria and specifications, final design requirements, and regulations governing the construction of the FSRU and LNG carriers.

5 Specifically, and most importantly, we have
6 observed that the consequence modeling methodologies used to
7 calculate the exclusion zones for the various spill
8 scenarios are fatally flawed.

T005-36.3

T005-36.3

The Independent Risk Assessment (IRA) has been updated since issuance of the October 2004 Draft EIS/EIR. The lead agencies directed preparation of the current IRA, and the U.S. Department of Energy's Sandia National Laboratories independently reviewed it, as discussed in Section 4.2 and Appendix C.

9 I, too, have spoken with both Professor James Fay
10 and Jerry Havens, and they have raised the same concerns we
11 raise here, today, regarding the methodologies.

12 The EIS failed to use a vapor dispersion and
13 thermal radiation consequence modeling program that is
14 appropriate for LNG spills over water, such as the
15 methodologies developed and approved by the Federal Energy
16 Regulatory Commission.

T005-36.4

Section 4.2.7.6 and the IRA (Appendix C1) discuss the models and assumptions used and the verification process. Sandia National Laboratories (Appendix C2) concluded that the models used were appropriate and produced valid results.

17 Instead, the EIS used the National Institute of
18 Standards and Technology fire dynamics simulator
19 methodology, which is inappropriate for an LNG application.

20 The NIST model is generally used for a building
21 burning scenario, and not intended for materials that are
22 denser than air, such as LNG.

23 In contrast, the FERC methodology is specifically
24 intended to do consequence modeling for LNG explosions on
25 water, to determine the extent of an appropriate exclusion

T005-36.4

The Project is regulated by the USCG and MARAD under the authority of the Deepwater Port Act. FERC's regulations are prescriptive and standardized to address the general siting of onshore LNG terminals. In contrast, due to various different designs of deepwater ports, the USCG conducts site-specific independent risk and consequence analyses using the most recent guidance and modeling techniques. The guidance used for Cabrillo Port is Sandia National Laboratories' "Guidance on Risk Analysis and Safety Implications of a Large Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Spill Over Water." This report recommends a framework for analyses of large LNG spills onto water. It was prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), and an external peer review panel evaluated the analyses, conclusions, and recommendations presented.

1 zone.

2 The EIS does not explain why the NIST methodology
3 was used, instead of the more appropriate FERC methodology.

4 Thus, the consequence methodology and resulting
5 exclusion zones calculated for the Cabrillo Port project and
6 draft EIS are incorrect, because they are calculated using
7 the wrong model.

8 This error could prove fatal to the certification
9 of the final EIS, if it is not corrected. This flaw is
10 proper grounds to extend the public comment period and allow
11 the agencies additional time to gather the necessary
12 additional information relevant to calculating a proper
13 safety baseline.

14 Additionally, the safety analysis in the EIS fails
15 to consider the safety impacts associated with the entire
16 life cycle of the project, which include impacts associated
17 with extraction of the gas from a foreign source, and
18 tanking the LNG to the FSRU.

19 We request that our safety expert be allowed an
20 opportunity and clearance to review the Confidential
21 Independent Risk Assessment report, that is withheld from
22 the general public.

23 In addition to flaws in the safety analysis, the
24 EIS mischaracterizes the FSRU's proximity to the shipping
25 lanes by calculating the distance from the center of the

T005-36.4
(cont'd)

T005-36.5

T005-36.6

T005-36.7

T005-36.5

Executive Order 12114, Environmental Effects Abroad of Major Federal Actions, requires Federal agencies to consider the potential environmental effects of major Federal actions that could significantly affect the global commons outside the jurisdiction of any nation. Executive Order 12114 is not applicable to the extraction and development of natural gas in foreign countries.

An evaluation of the Project's environmental effects abroad must also be viewed within the context of section 15040 of the State CEQA Guidelines, which specifically defines and correspondingly limits the authority provided to State and local agencies under the CEQA.

The Applicant has stated that the source of the natural gas for this Project would be either Australia, Malaysia, or Indonesia. As these countries are sovereign nations, the Applicant would be required to comply with those countries' applicable environmental laws and regulations pertaining to the extraction and development of natural gas fields as well as those pertaining to the liquefaction and transfer of LNG to LNG carriers. Consideration of the Applicant's compliance with a foreign nation's applicable laws and regulations is beyond the scope of this EIS/EIR.

The Applicant has indicated that the Scarborough natural gas field in the state of Western Australia could be a potential source of natural gas for the Project. In May 2005, the Honourable Ian Macfarlane, the Australian Federal Minister for Industry, Tourism and Resources, stated, "Development of the Scarborough Field and related support facilities must be carried out in accordance with applicable laws and regulations of both the Australian Government (federal) and the State Government in Western Australia. Any activities will be subject to assessment and approvals under the applicable environmental legislative regimes. These include, among others, the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation (EPBC) Act 1999, governing matters of national environmental significance, and, under State legislation, the Western Australian Environmental Protection Act 1986. The objectives of the Commonwealth's environmental regulatory regimes are to provide for the protection of the environment and ensure that any petroleum activity is carried out in a way that is consistent with the principles of ecologically sustainable development." (Appendix L contains a copy of this letter.)

Section 1.3 has been revised to include information on Indonesian

and Malaysian environmental requirements that would regulate impacts related to producing and exporting natural gas. All three countries have existing LNG liquefaction facilities.

T005-36.6

The Independent Risk Assessment is contained in Appendix C1.

T005-36.7

The text in Section 4.3.1.1 and elsewhere in the EIS/EIR has been revised in response to the comment.

1 lanes.

2 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Thank you, Ms. Finigan.

3 MS. FINIGAN: Thank you.

4 (Applause.)

5 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: John. I'm going to let you
6 pronounce your own last name, okay?

COMMENTER
T005-37

7 MR. BUSE: Thank you. I was going to let you have
8 a stab at it. But my name's John Buse, I'm an attorney at
9 the Environmental Defense Center, also speaking, tonight, on
10 behalf of the California Coastal Protection Network.

11 I'll be discussing the issues of air quality,
12 onshore pipeline siting, and environmental justice.

13 Now, the project's total air pollutant emissions,
14 both from stationery sources and mobile sources, are
15 considerable. Stationery sources will be required to
16 purchase emissions credits under Ventura County Air
17 Pollution Control District's New Source Review Rule.

T005-37.1

18 In addition, federal conformity analysis will be
19 required. And the conformity analysis may also require
20 purchase of emissions credits for offsetting mobile source
21 emissions.

T005-37.2

22 But the EIS/EIR provides no analysis of the
23 feasibility of obtaining these credits. In fact, the
24 project will likely exhaust most, or all, of the available
25 credits, leaving none available for other economic growth in

T005-37.1

The Project has been modified since issuance of the March 2006 Revised Draft EIR. See Section 1.4.2 for a summary of Project changes. Section 4.6.1.3 contains revised information on Project emissions and proposed control measures.

T005-37.2

The Applicant has made commitments to use engines in onshore construction equipment that would comply with USEPA's more stringent Tier 2, 3 or 4 emission standards. This would result in *de minimis* emissions levels; therefore, MARAD and the USCG have determined that the General Conformity Rule no longer applies, and a General Conformity Determination is not required.

Section 4.6.1.3 and Section 4.6.2 contain revised Project emission estimates and a revised discussion of the applicability of the General Conformity Rule to the Project, respectively. Appendix G4 contains a copy of the revised General Conformity analysis.

1 Ventura County.

2 If the premise of the EIS/EIR is that mitigation
3 will occur, at least in part in the form of obtaining these
4 credits, then there needs to be an analysis of the
5 feasibility of obtaining the credits.

6 The conformity analysis is not even provided in
7 the draft EIS/EIR, yet essential conclusions in the document
8 state that mitigation will depend on the results of the
9 conformity analysis. The public and the decision makers
10 need to see this analysis before they can make decisions
11 about the project and the ability of these measures to
12 mitigate its impacts.

13 On the related issues of onshore pipeline siting
14 and environmental justice, well, these issues are tied
15 together by the fact that in Ventura County there's a
16 perception, that's justified by history, I believe, that
17 industrial, and other undesirable uses, tend to get dumped
18 at the Ormond Beach area, in Southeast Oxnard, with a
19 disproportionate effect on sensitive wildlife, and on low-
20 income and minority communities.

21 The EIS/EIR acknowledges the potential of the
22 project to disrupt wetland hydrology, but it provides no
23 specific mitigation measures to mitigate these potential
24 impacts. In only says that basically the project will do
25 something to avoid wetlands impacts. This isn't enough,

T005-37.2
(cont'd)

T005-37.3

See the response to Comment T005-37.1.

T005-37.3

T005-37.4

The CLSC, the USCG, and MARAD received an application for a deepwater port off the shore of Ventura County and have therefore analyzed that location. The Applicant used recommendations from the California Coastal Commission's 1978 Offshore LNG Terminal Study report (see Appendix E) to identify the site of the proposed Project.

The Applicant selected the proposed location for Cabrillo Port by analyzing known marine hazards, existing pipelines, distance from shore, distance from existing fixed offshore facilities, and sea floor slope and topography. Additionally, the natural gas would have to be delivered to a pipeline network for transmission and distribution. The Oxnard area has such a network that is easily accessible at the coast.

T005-37.4

Section 4.19 identifies populations with a relatively high representation of minority or low-income status and addresses whether any of the Project's significant impacts could disproportionately affect those populations.

Section 4.8.4 contains information on impacts to terrestrial biological resources at Ormond Beach.

T005-37.5

Section 4.8.4 contains information on mitigation measures for wetland impacts.

T005-37.5

1 there needs to be more information developed to provide
 2 specific mitigations to deal with this impact on this very
 3 sensitive site.

T005-37.5
(cont'd)

4 Similarly, with the environmental justice impacts,
 5 the document acknowledges a disproportionate impact, but
 6 provides only the vaguest mitigation measure that affected
 7 communities will be notified.

T005-37.6

8 We believe that NEPA, and CEQA, and President
 9 Clinton's Executive Order, 12898, dealing with environmental
 10 justice, require more, and more needs to be specified in
 11 terms of specific mitigation measures for these impacts.

12 I know it's difficult to suspend the process, but
 13 we believe it's necessary to do so in order to provide this
 14 needed information in a recirculated EIS/EIR.

15 Thank you.

16 (Applause.)

COMMENTER
T005-38

17 MS. KROP: Thank you, and good evening. My name
 18 is Linda Krop, I'm the Chief Counsel of the Environmental
 19 Defense Center, and we're here, representing the California
 20 Coastal Protection Network.

21 I would like to close our comments tonight by
 22 focusing on two remaining points. First, that the draft
 23 EIS/EIR must be revised to include an analysis of a
 24 reasonable range of alternatives.

T005-38.1

25 Second, the time line under the Deep Water Port

T005-37.6

Sections 4.19.1 and 4.19.4 contain information on potential Project impacts on minority and low-income communities and mitigation measures to address such impacts.

T005-38.1

Sections 1.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3.1, 3.3.2, 3.3.3, 4.10, and 4.10.1.3 contain information on the range of alternatives evaluated. Under NEPA and the CEQA, a reasonable range of alternatives must be considered. NEPA requires consideration of a "reasonable" number of alternatives. In determining the scope of alternatives, the emphasis is on "reasonable." "Reasonable" alternatives include those that are practical and feasible from the technical and economic standpoint and using common sense (CEQ 40 Questions; #2a).

The information must be sufficient to enable reviewers and decision-makers to evaluate and compare alternatives. The State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6(a) provides, in part, "An EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project."

The EIS/EIR initially evaluated 18 locations for the FSRU as potential locations for the deepwater port. It built on previous California Coastal Commission studies that evaluated nearly 100 locations. Sections 3.3.7 and 3.3.9 discuss alternate locations and technologies that were considered.

1 Act should be suspended to ensure complete environmental
2 review for the proposed project.

T005-38.2

3 First, regarding alternatives. The draft report
4 fails to include any environmentally preferred alternatives,
5 nor does the report comply with the requirements, under NEPA
6 and CEQA, that an EIS/EIR must analyze a range of
7 alternatives.

T005-38.3

8 Instead, in this case, the report rejects most
9 suggested alternatives, without analysis and, thus, robs the
10 agencies of their discretion to reduce or avoid impacts by
11 selecting or imposing another option.

T005-38.4

12 For example, the EIS/EIR rejects energy
13 conservation efficiency and renewable sources, on the
14 grounds that these alternatives will occur with or without
15 the proposed project. However, the report fails to identify
16 any specific mandatory programs, or to quantify the energy
17 savings and supplies, and how they would meet the State's
18 demand.

T005-38.5

19 Conclusory statements, like this, are inadequate
20 to comply with State, and federal environmental review laws.

21 In addition, the draft report rejects other LNG
22 projects as alternatives, despite the fact that they are
23 proposed, now, to supply natural gas to California.

T005-38.6

24 Some of these alternatives are relegated to the
25 cumulative impact section, which makes no sense at all and

T005-38.2

All deepwater port applications fall under the authority of the Deepwater Port Act, which requires that a decision on the application be made within 330 days of the publication of the Notice of Application in the Federal Register. The Notice of Application for the Cabrillo Port Project was published in the Federal Register on January 27, 2004. Although the comment period (53 days) could not be extended at that time, a March 2006 Revised Draft EIR was recirculated under the CEQA for an additional public review period of 60 days. Section 1.4.1 contains additional information on this topic.

Section 1.5 contains information on opportunities for public comment. After the MARAD final license hearing, the public will have 45 days to comment on the Final EIS/EIR and the license application. The Federal and State agencies will have an additional 45 days to provide comments to the MARAD Administrator. The Administrator must issue the Record of Decision within 90 days after the final license hearing. The CSLC will hold a hearing to certify the EIR and make the decision whether to grant a lease. The California Coastal Commission will also hold a hearing. Comments received will be evaluated before any final decision is made regarding the proposed Project.

T005-38.3

Section 6.2 contains information on the environmentally preferable alternative under NEPA and the environmentally superior alternative under the CEQA.

T005-38.4

Both NEPA and the CEQA require the consideration of alternatives to a proposed project. A lead agency's lack of jurisdiction over a potential alternative is one factor that it may consider in determining if a potential alternative is feasible, reasonable, and merits detailed study in an EIS/EIR. Whether a potential alternative is purely hypothetical or speculative, or whether the potential alternative can be accomplished in a successful manner in a reasonable period of time are additional factors the lead agency may consider in assessing the feasibility and reasonability of the potential alternative.

From a NEPA perspective, while a Federal agency must analyze "a range of reasonable alternatives" (as opposed to any and all possible alternatives), and may be required to analyze an alternative that is outside the capability of an applicant and that is outside the jurisdiction of the agency, the threshold question in determining whether to analyze any alternative is whether that alternative would be a "reasonable" alternative. Reasonable alternatives include those that are practical and feasible from the technical and economic standpoint and using common sense (CEQ 40 Questions; #2a).

To provide for an effective "hard look" at the alternatives the agency must limit the range to those alternatives that will best serve the environmental review process, and not needlessly examine and discuss in depth remote or speculative alternatives that that discussion does not facilitate a better decision making process. As stated in 40 CFR 1502.14(a), the EIS should "rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives, and for alternatives which were eliminated from detailed study, briefly discuss the reasons for their having been eliminated."

Section 15126.6(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines states, in part, "[t]he Lead Agency is responsible for selecting a range of project alternatives for examination and must publicly disclose its reasoning for selecting those alternatives." The California Supreme Court in the Citizens of Goleta Valley case recognized that while an agency's jurisdiction was only one factor to consider, "[t]he law does not require in-depth review of alternatives that cannot be realistically considered and successfully accomplished." In addition, the discussion in section 15364 in the State CEQA Guidelines states that "[t]he lack of legal powers of an agency to use in imposing an alternative or mitigation measure may be as great a limitation as any economic, environmental, social, or technological factor."

Chapter 3 discusses energy conservation, efficiency, and renewable sources of energy, and explains why these potential alternatives were not studied in detail in the EIS/EIR. The range of alternatives studied in detail is reasonable and conforms to NEPA and the CEQA requirements.

T005-38.5

Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 address conservation and renewable energy sources, within the context of the California Energy Commission's 2005 Integrated Energy Report and other State and

Federal energy reports, as alternatives to replace additional supplies of natural gas.

T005-38.6

Sections 3.3.5, 3.3.7, and 3.3.8 contain information on other LNG projects. Section 4.20, the cumulative analysis, also considers other LNG projects because the licensing and permitting processes will be completed independently.

92

1 fails to provide a comparative analysis.

2 The Mexico projects are rejected because of
3 potential legal challenges. This project may also face
4 legal challenges. Does that make it infeasible? Should you
5 dismiss it right off the bat?

6 Other reasons for rejecting the Mexico projects
7 are because of concerns about distribution and quality
8 issues, which the State is already negotiating in terms of
9 looking at border-crossing issues.

10 Other locations offshore California were rejected
11 because they would be located within the Channel Islands
12 National Park and National Marine Sanctuary. However, the
13 National Marine Sanctuary boundaries may be expanded, and
14 this project may conflict with the purposes and regulations
15 of the Sanctuary.

16 Another reason for rejecting alternatives is that
17 they are not under the jurisdiction and authority of the
18 Coast Guard, MARAD, and State Lands Commission. Again,
19 under NEPA and CEQA, this is not a valid reason to reject
20 alternatives.

21 Accordingly, the report must be revised to analyze
22 these alternatives, especially environmentally-preferred
23 alternatives, such as conservation, efficiency, and
24 renewables.

25 Finally, we request that you suspend the deadlines

T005-38.6
(cont'd)

T005-38.7

T005-38.7

Section 3.3.5 contains updated information on this topic.

T005-38.8

The FSRU would be located outside of the current boundary of the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary (CINMS) and vessels associated with Cabrillo Port operations would not be expected to enter the CINMS. Sections 4.7.1.4, 4.13.2.2, and 4.20.1.5 discuss the potential expansion of the CINMS boundary, which is not proposed at this time. Sections 4.7.4, 4.15.4, 4.16.4, and 4.18.4 describe potential impacts on the marine environment and proposed mitigation measures to reduce those potential impacts.

T005-38.8

T005-38.9

Section 3.3 contains revised text on this topic.

T005-38.10

See the response to Comment T005-38.5.

T005-38.9

T005-38.11

See the response to Comment T005-38-2.

T005-38.10

T005-38.11

1 under the Deepwater Port Act so that the agencies can obtain
2 additional information necessary to successfully complete
3 the environmental review process.

T005-38.11
(cont'd)

T005-38.12

See the response to Comment T005-38.1.

4 This additional information includes analysis of a
5 reasonable range of alternatives, a complete analysis of
6 project impacts, all the way from extraction, production,
7 processing, liquification, and transportation, a complete
8 analysis of safety impacts, including the appropriate
9 methodology to recalculate the safety and exclusion zones,
10 and an update of the State's 1978 siting study.

T005-38.12

T005-38.13

T005-38.13

Executive Order 12114, Environmental Effects Abroad of Major Federal Actions, requires Federal agencies to consider the potential environmental effects of major Federal actions that could significantly affect the global commons outside the jurisdiction of any nation. Executive Order 12114 is not applicable to the extraction and development of natural gas in foreign countries.

T005-38.14

An evaluation of the Project's environmental effects abroad must also be viewed within the context of section 15040 of the State CEQA Guidelines, which specifically defines and correspondingly limits the authority provided to State and local agencies under the CEQA.

T005-38.15

11 Thank you for your time and consideration.

12 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Thank you.

13 (Applause.)

14 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: After Manuel Herrera, our
15 next speakers will be Keith York, Melissa Zavala, Alicia
16 Melendez, Irma Lopez, and Leilani Costello.

17 MR. HERRERA: My name is Manuel Herrera. I was
18 born, raised, and hope to die in Oxnard, California.
19 However, I'd like it to be of natural causes, and not due to
20 any kind of LNG incident.

COMMENTER
T005-39

21 (Laughter.)

22 MR. HERRERA: As you know, we all live in an
23 earthquake country, and all it takes is one incident for
24 there to be a catastrophic event. So we definitely do not
25 want this here. The people have spoken, as you can see.

T005-39.1

The Applicant has indicated that the Scarborough natural gas field in the state of Western Australia could be a potential source of natural gas for the Project. In May 2005, the Honourable Ian Macfarlane, the Australian Federal Minister for Industry, Tourism and Resources, stated, "Development of the Scarborough Field and related support facilities must be carried out in accordance with applicable laws and regulations of both the Australian Government (federal) and the State Government in Western Australia. Any activities will be subject to assessment and approvals under the applicable environmental legislative regimes. These include, among others, the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation (EPBC) Act 1999, governing matters of national environmental significance, and, under State legislation, the Western Australian Environmental Protection Act 1986. The objectives of the Commonwealth's environmental regulatory regimes are to provide for the protection of the environment and

ensure that any petroleum activity is carried out in a way that is consistent with the principles of ecologically sustainable development." (Appendix L contains a copy of this letter.)

Section 1.3 has been revised to include information on Indonesian and Malaysian environmental requirements that would regulate impacts related to producing and exporting natural gas. All three countries have existing LNG liquefaction facilities.

T005-38.14

Section 4.2.7.6 and the Independent Risk Assessment (Appendix C1) contain information on public safety impacts from various incidents at the FSRU. The analysis indicates that the maximum impact distance of an accident would involve a vapor cloud dispersion extending 6.3 nautical miles (7.3 miles) from the FSRU. The FSRU would be located approximately 12.01 nautical miles (13.83 miles) offshore; therefore, consequences of an accident involving LNG transport by carrier and storage on the FSRU would extend no closer than 5.7 nautical distance (6.5 miles) from the shoreline.

Sections 2.2.4, 4.3.1.4, and 4.3.4 contain information on the safety zone and Area to be Avoided and potential impacts on marine traffic. The FSRU would be able to rotate 360 degrees around the mooring turret. The safety zone would extend 500 m from the circle formed by the FSRU's stern, the outer edge of the facility, rotating around the mooring turret. The safety zone could not be made any larger because its size is governed by international law.

T005-38.15

Section 3.3.7.1 contains information on this topic.

T005-39.1

Section 4.11 contains revised information on seismic and geologic hazards and mitigation that specifically addresses the potential damage to proposed pipelines from a direct rupture along fault lines. Appendices J1 through J4 contain additional evaluations of seismic hazards.

1 Unfortunately, this is not a project that is up
2 for vote by the citizens, because if that were the case,
3 this would not go through, whatsoever.

T005-39.2

4 But aside from those reasons, how about decreased
5 property value, potential terrorist attacks, declined
6 tourism? It looks like the only people that come up here
7 and are for this project are either out-of-towners, people
8 who don't live here, or people whose income depends on this
9 project. Everyone else, who lives here, seems to be against
10 it.

T005-39.3

T005-39.4

T005-39.5

11 Someone mentioned that this would highly affect
12 the Latino community. Well, I'm a Latino, and I live here,
13 and I'm concerned, and I'm here.

T005-39.6

14 This same company, that wants to put this project
15 together, has made quite a bit of contributions to local,
16 nonprofit Latino organizations, so is that a coincidence or
17 you be the judge.

18 I'm asking for a 60-day extension, as well as
19 maybe researching other alternatives. And basically, the
20 bottom line is the people of Oxnard don't want this. And we
21 ask for your support on this, on not allowing this to
22 happen.

T005-39.7

T005-39.8

23 And I basically ask you, if you lived in Oxnard,
24 if your family lived here, your mom, your dad, your kids,
25 what would your vote be?

T005-39.2

Section 1.1 discusses regulations and agencies involved in the licensing and potential approval of the proposed Project. The USCG and MARAD will hold a final public hearing on the license with a 45-day comment period before the Federal Record of Decision is issued. The CSLC also will hold a hearing to certify the EIR and make the decision whether to grant a lease.

Section 1.5 contains additional information regarding public notification and opportunities for public comment.

T005-39.3

Section 4.16.1.2 contains updated information on property values.

T005-39.4

Table 4.2-2 and Sections 4.2.6.1 and 4.2.7.6 contain information on the threat of terrorist attacks.

T005-39.5

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

T005-39.6

Sections 4.19.1 and 4.19.4 contain information on potential Project impacts on minority and low-income communities and mitigation measures to address such impacts.

T005-39.7

All deepwater port applications fall under the authority of the Deepwater Port Act, which requires that a decision on the application be made within 330 days of the publication of the Notice of Application in the Federal Register. The Notice of Application for the Cabrillo Port Project was published in the Federal Register on January 27, 2004. Although the comment period (53 days) could

not be extended at that time, a March 2006 Revised Draft EIR was recirculated under the CEQA for an additional public review period of 60 days. Section 1.4.1 contains additional information on this topic.

Section 1.5 contains information on opportunities for public comment. After the MARAD final license hearing, the public will have 45 days to comment on the Final EIS/EIR and the license application. The Federal and State agencies will have an additional 45 days to provide comments to the MARAD Administrator. The Administrator must issue the Record of Decision within 90 days after the final license hearing. The CSLC will hold a hearing to certify the EIR and make the decision whether to grant a lease. The California Coastal Commission will also hold a hearing. Comments received will be evaluated before any final decision is made regarding the proposed Project.

T005-39.8

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

1 Thank you.

2 (Applause.)

3 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: The next speaker is

4 Keith York.

5 MR. YORK: The points that I'd like to make are
6 with regard to our own culpability in creating the demand
7 for this fuel.

8 Most of us, in this room, know that the demands
9 for this fuel come from electrical generation, and from home
10 heating, and other uses of natural gas.

11 We are in a position to mitigate the need for this
12 resource by simply insulating our homes, and those
13 businesses, where we work, and by employing resources, such
14 as solar power, to mitigate the need for the electrical
15 generation that draws upon this resource.

16 So my point is, we should all go home, reconsider
17 what we're doing in our lives to mitigate the need for such
18 a resource, as what these people would like to bring to us,
19 today.

20 Thank you.

21 (Applause.)

22 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: The next speaker is

23 Melissa Zavala. She may have left.

24 Alicia Melendez? Irma Lopez?

25 MS. LOPEZ: I'm here.

T005-40.1

Sections 1.2.2, 1.2.3, 1.2.4, 3.3.1, 3.3.2, and 4.10.1.3 contain information on the need for natural gas, the role and status of energy conservation and renewable energy sources, and the California Energy Action Plan.

COMMENTER
T005-40

T005-40.1

1 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Right now.

2 MS. LOPEZ: Thank you, again, for your time and
3 being so patient with us. We have a true concern for our
4 community. It's not just a NIMBY situation, we have a true
5 concern for our families, here.

6 My name is Irma Lopez, and I'm a 30-year resident
7 of Oxnard, and a lifelong resident of Ventura County. My
8 parents were both born in this County. Members of my family
9 have resided in this County for over a hundred years, and
10 many members are currently living in eight out of the ten
11 cities that comprise Ventura County.

12 Oxnard is the largest city in Ventura County, and
13 the 20th largest city in California, and is now being
14 considered as a port of entry for liquified natural gas. I
15 am extremely concerned for my family's safety, and the
16 safety of all of our residents.

17 In the weeks after the election, and before
18 tonight's hearing, we have been inundated with propaganda,
19 our mailboxes are filled with brochures, full-page newspaper
20 ads, and our ears assaulted with radio announcements, in
21 English and in Spanish.

22 These so-called informational meetings have been
23 held at luxurious locations, including the private Tower
24 Club, that have been hosted by the developers. The
25 developers have donated money to several nonprofits,

COMMENTER
T005-41

T005-41.1

Section 4.2 and Appendix C contain additional and revised
information on public safety.

T005-41.1

1 including many Latino organizations, to curry favor for
2 their project.

3 It is well-known that Oxnard is a blue collar
4 community, comprised of many diverse communities, with the
5 majority of the city being minority.

6 For most of my adult life I have been involved in
7 many civil rights organizations. One of my main concerns
8 has been environmental justice. Communities with high
9 concentrations of people of color have historically been
10 targeted for locating environmentally questionable
11 practices, such as landfills, airports, polluting heavy
12 industries, and freeways. We don't want to have LNG on that
13 list.

14 I don't think it's a coincidence that this is the
15 fourth LNG facility that has been proposed in our city since
16 1977.

17 Several years ago, residents of Ojai, a small
18 community of approximately 8,000 residents, many of whom are
19 fairly well off, were able to stop a landfill at
20 Weldon Canyon, yet the county landfill in our city, which
21 was located next to many homes, and over an aquifer, was
22 extended beyond the long-established closure date.

23 I applaud the residents of Ojai. But many of our
24 residents, in Oxnard, toil in the agricultural fields, from
25 daybreak, to set down to put food on their tables, and also

T005-41.2

T005-41.2

Sections 4.19.1 and 4.19.4 contain information on potential Project impacts on minority and low-income communities and mitigation measures to address such impacts.

1 on our tables, and do not have the time or energy left to
2 defend their interests.

3 I have several newspaper articles in front of me,
4 here, and many of them, such as one in the front page of the
5 L.A. Times, this past Friday, stated that "our ports are an
6 enormous target for terrorism."

7 We have a deepsea port in our community, and we
8 also have two Naval facilities.

9 So I would hope that you would listen to our
10 concern. Thank you.

11 (Applause.)

12 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Thank you.

13 The next speakers I have on my list are Leilani
14 Costello, Alan Redding, Esther Redding, Octavio Sifuentes,
15 Kate Crandall, and Angela Digiglio.

16 Leilani Costello? Alan Redding? Esther Redding?
17 Octavio Sifuentes.

18 MR. SIFUENTES: Yes. My name's Octavio Sifuentes,
19 I'm a Professor at Ventura College.

20 And I went out one day to find out about this
21 issue, and what I found out, mainly looking at the LNG
22 industry, is the fact that they said this project, as in the
23 Cabrillo project, this project is a market-driven project.

24 So let's sell the project to the people of Oxnard
25 and we'll -- you'll be an example for selling more projects

T005-41.3

T005-41.3

Table 4.2-2 and Sections 4.2.6.1 and 4.2.7.6 contain information on the potential threat of a terrorist attack.

Section 4.3.4 discusses impacts associated with the increased vessel traffic due to the proposed Project. The FSRU would be located 3.5 NM (3.54 miles) from the eastern boundary of the Point Mugu Sea Range (Pacific Missile Range). Impacts MT-5 and MT-6 in Section 4.3.4 discuss the potential impacts of the presence of the FSRU on Naval operations and the operation of the Point Mugu Sea Range.

T005-42

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

COMMENTER
T005-42

1 all over this world.

2 And this process of selling is also insulting to
3 me, as a Mexican American, because they pick a couple of
4 puppet leaders to say that the Latino community is in
5 support of this. That's not it.

6 And the reason that many of the Latino community
7 are not here is because they get up very early in the
8 morning to go to work, and put that food on the table that
9 you eat.

10 Also, the -- so the process of selling to our
11 community is to corrupt our leaders and pretend that they
12 are in favor of this project. I resent that, as a Mexican
13 American, being used.

14 I'm representing myself, and I don't pretend to
15 represent our community, but I do feel insulted that they
16 take these people and pretend that they represent me.

17 Thank you.

18 (Applause.)

19 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Kate Crandall? Angela
20 Digiglio?

21 All right, the next speakers I have on my list are
22 Mildred Miele, Marybeth Kawinski-Power, Angela Slaff,
23 Dr. B. Dean, Donald Wallace, and Lauraine Effress, Charles
24 Dean, and Tomoko Tsuji.

25 Mildred Miele? Marybeth Kawinski-Power?

1 MS. KAWINSKI-POWER: I came to Oxnard --

2 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Hold the microphone down

3 near you. Thank you very much.

4 MS. KAWINSKI-POWER: I'm Marybeth Kawinski-Power.

5 I came to Oxnard 14 years ago because I was touched by the

6 beauty of my City, and the diversity. But most of all, the

7 wonderful expression of those of us, who love this beautiful

8 land God gave us to steward.

9 I have heard how many others feel the people of

10 Oxnard can be fooled and are apathetic, how they think their

11 government and representatives are not influenced by

12 corporations and lobbyists.

13 Ever since I marched in the People's Park

14 demonstration, in Berkeley, in 1968, I cannot be silent to

15 the excesses of the powerful. I am just one person, but

16 life is meant to be -- is not meant to be observed. And no

17 matter what authority you have, you have put my City and its

18 people at risk.

19 Statistics, reports, maps, and fancy brochures

20 will not make us, as a community, be able to stomach

21 something we do not want.

22 The so-called experts, here, are like paid experts

23 at a trial. You can buy experts for any point you want to

24 make. Take your project elsewhere.

25 (Applause.)

COMMENTER
T005-43

T005-43.1

Section 4.2 and Appendix C contain additional and revised information on public safety.

T005-43.1

1 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Angela Slaff? Dr. B. Dean?
2 Donald Wallace? Lauraine Effress?

3 MS. EFFRESS: Good evening. I'm Lauraine Effress,
4 and I live on the Oxnard Coast.

5 The most disturbing thing to me about the Cabrillo
6 Port is the fact that it proposes to use untested
7 technology.

8 In conversations I had with Billiton executives
9 and marine experts at the open house, at the scoping
10 meeting, I was repeatedly told about the use of computer
11 models.

12 I think that Billiton personnel and California
13 regulators need to be reminded of two important points.
14 First, computer models are only as good as the assumptions
15 upon which they are built.

16 Because so much about the ocean bottom, wind
17 currents, wave patterns, sediments, tsunamis, offshore
18 earthquake faults, and icky, sticky corrosive, fluorescent,
19 electric, nice, and nasty marine critters is not known. And
20 because Mother Nature has a way of constantly surprising us,
21 any computer model being used, at present, is ipso facto,
22 incomplete.

23 Second is the law of unforeseen consequences,
24 compounded with chaos theory. Chaos theory is not something
25 dreamed up by Michael Crichton or Steven Spielberg for

COMMENTER
T005-44

T005-44.1

T005-44.2

T005-44.1

Sections 2.1 and 4.2.7.3 contain information on design criteria and specifications, final design requirements, and regulations governing the construction of the FSRU and LNG carriers.

T005-44.2

The Independent Risk Assessment (IRA) has been updated since issuance of the October 2004 Draft EIS/EIR. The lead agencies directed preparation of the current IRA, and the U.S. Department of Energy's Sandia National Laboratories independently reviewed it, as discussed in Section 4.2 and Appendix C.

Section 4.2.7.6 and the IRA (Appendix C1) discuss the models and assumptions used and the verification process. Sandia National Laboratories (Appendix C2) concluded that the models used were appropriate and produced valid results.

1 Jurassic Park, chaos theory is a real theory, it helps us
2 understand that there are usually unforeseen consequences
3 when elaborate plans are made and executed with incomplete
4 data.

5 As an example, let's Kansai Airport, off the coast
6 of Osaka, Japan. Kansai Airport was planned to be housed on
7 a manmade island, off the coast of Osaka, because Japan is
8 space starved, and because an offshore facility would avoid
9 many of the environmental and noise-nuisance complaints from
10 residents in densely populated areas.

11 The best and brightest engineers, marine
12 biologists, geologists, et cetera, worked on Kansai. The
13 most modern, most elaborate and detailed computer models
14 were utilized to ensure that the frequent typhoons and
15 earthquakes, to which the area is prone, would be taken into
16 consideration, just as BHP Billiton will do.

17 It was even acknowledged that the island was
18 inevitably going to sink. The computer models, used by the
19 engineers, expected the island to sink 38 feet in 50 years,
20 that is by 2044, as the project was completed in 1944 [sic].
21 It sunk 38 feet in six years. In fact, the fix, which is on
22 now, is taking hundreds of millions of dollars, and no one
23 knows whether or not it will work.

24 So I'll leave out the rest, in the interest of
25 time. But if you want to try an experiment, that amounts to

T005-44.3

T005-44.3

Section 2.1 contains information on design criteria and specifications, final design requirements, and regulations governing the construction of the FSRU. The Cabrillo Port must be designed in accordance with applicable standards, and the U.S. Coast Guard has final approval. Section 4.2.4 contains information on Federal and State agency jurisdiction and cooperation. The Deepwater Port Act specifies regulations that all deepwater ports must meet; Section 4.2.7.3 contains information on design and safety standards for the deepwater port. Section 4.2.8.2 contains information on pipeline safety and inspections. Impact EJ-1 in Section 4.19.4 addresses additional pipeline design requirements in areas of low-income and minority communities. The EIS/EIR's analyses have been developed with consideration of these factors and regulations and in full conformance with the requirements of NEPA and the CEQA.

T005-44.4

T005-44.4

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

T005-44.5

Thank you for the information.

T005-44.5

1 a floating, giant grenade off the Oxnard Coast, then I
 2 suggest that you build it, first, in the Bass Straits,
 3 between Melbourne and Tasmania, from whence the gas will
 4 come in the first place. If it works there, come back in
 5 ten years and I'll be happy to give you a more receptive
 6 hearing.

7 Thank you.

8 (Applause.)

9 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: I'm going to read ahead for
 10 the next several speakers. Doug Temple, Allen Pollock,
 11 Jeremy Meyer, Sandra Bates, Diane Safford.

12 Is Charles Dean here? Tomoko Tsuji? Doug Temple?
 13 Allen Pollock?

14 MR. POLLOCK: Yes, sir.

15 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: You're up, thank you.

16 MR. POLLOCK: Good evening. My name is
 17 Al Pollock. I'm here on behalf of two of the most beautiful
 18 grandchildren in the world. I would have brought them here,
 19 but I'm going to take some mercy on you guys.

20 (Laughter.)

21 MR. POLLOCK: Anyway, my big question is why
 22 Oxnard? Why not Catalina, off the coast of Malibu? Does
 23 the "Governator" have too many friends there? I mean, we
 24 could take those buffalo and bring them over here, and send
 25 them out west, where they belong.

T005-44.5
(cont'd)

T005-45.1

The USCG, MARAD, and the CLSC received an application for a deepwater port off the shore of Ventura County. The USCG and MARAD are therefore required under NEPA to evaluate this alternative as the Applicant's preferred alternative. The agencies have evaluated this alternative in comparison with the other reasonable alternatives in compliance with NEPA and the CEQA.

The EIS/EIR initially evaluated 18 locations for the FSRU as potential locations for the deepwater port. It built on previous California Coastal Commission studies that evaluated nearly 100 locations. Section 3.3.7 contains information on other locations that were considered.

COMMENTER
T005-45

T005-45.1

1 Anyway, this is an inopportune time to get a
2 proper hearing on Cabrillo, and pick this, this is our
3 shopping season for one of our most important holidays.

4 And one scenario gets to me. What happens when
5 one night, with very thick fog, as it happens off our coast,
6 a tanker, that's registered in Panama, and is full of
7 terrorists, run into the floating bomb that we have off our
8 coast?

9 I wish you would extend this project, for
10 consideration, another 30 years, so I can die and my kids
11 can move out.

12 Thank you.

13 (Applause.)

14 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Jeremy Meyer?

15 MR. MEYER: Good evening. My name's Jeremy Meyer,
16 and I am a resident of Oxnard, and for about four years I
17 was living in Surfside Three, which is right near the Ormond
18 Wetlands, so I had the great pleasure of every week walking
19 a couple of times through that area and enjoying what is
20 really a unique space, environmentally and just in terms of
21 the place of being, and experiencing. I think, if you
22 haven't walked there, if you haven't been along that area,
23 haven't spent some time, I really encourage you to do so.

24 I also was fortunate to experience, or
25 unfortunate, I guess, the Halaco plant there, with its

T005-45.2

Table 4.2-2 and Sections 4.2.6.1 and 4.2.7.6 contain information on the threat of terrorist attacks.

T005-45.2

T005-46.1

Thank you for the information.

T005-46.2

Sections 4.12 and 4.13 contain additional information on the former Halaco plant.

COMMENTER
T005-46

T005-46.1

T005-46.2

1 incredibly huge slag heap, that is illegal, according to
2 what was agreed to, initially, and has since remained there
3 despite legal battles.

4 So I have not a lot of confidence in the integrity
5 of the companies that seek to use our precious coastline for
6 their gain. You know, I experienced the residues on the
7 windows and so forth.

8 And I don't need to go into an incredible amount
9 on the facts of the case because so many people beforehand
10 have done an incredible job of laying out their positions on
11 this, and it seems that the facts clearly weigh on the side
12 of saying, yes, to the quality of our coastline, and the
13 quality of our lives, and a bigger vision, and saying no to
14 this project.

15 I would also encourage that you, as having
16 responsibility for deciding whether this gets approved or
17 denied, consider a larger vision, the vision of the people
18 that were involved in founding this country, of looking to
19 the seventh generation in terms of the impacts, and just
20 looking at is this going in the direction that we intend to
21 go. As a community, it seems definitely not. As a State,
22 as California goes, so goes the nation, so goes the world.
23 And as a planet.

24 We know that oil is peaking right now and it seems
25 like production is set to decline, and further fossil fuels

T005-46.2
(cont'd)

T005-46.3

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

T005-46.4

Sections 1.2.2, 1.2.3, 1.2.4, 3.3.1, 3.3.2, and 4.10.1.3 contain information on the need for natural gas, the role and status of energy conservation and renewable energy sources, and the California Energy Action Plan.

T005-46.3

T005-46.4

1 are limited, to no doubt, as developing nations are
2 increasing their need for it, as well.

3 So if we put one-tenth of the amount that we're
4 putting into efforts to reclaim fossil fuels, into efforts
5 to build renewable fuels, and get the competition going for
6 who can create the most efficient, renewable energy sources,
7 we would be done with our concerns about energy.

8 And, hopefully, if you can carry that kind of
9 vision, then we can get that going in that direction.

10 Thank you.

11 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Sandra Bates? Diane
12 Safford?

13 I'm sorry, you are here.

14 MS. BATES: Okay. I'm Sandy Bates, and I'm one of
15 the many Oxnard residents opposed to the LNG project. One
16 reason is I'm very interested in preserving the wetlands at
17 Ormond Beach. It's one of the few remaining wetlands in
18 California, we've lost many wetlands over the years due to
19 development.

20 I'm also well aware of the fact that this area is
21 susceptible to liquefaction. I've lived here for 28 years
22 and I didn't realize it when I first moved here, how
23 dangerous it is if we have an earthquake.

24 The LNG pipes have never been placed on a
25 shoreline or underground, in an area which has been

T005-46.4
(cont'd)

T005-47.1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

T005-47.2

Project impacts on coastal ecosystems would be limited to the pipeline corridor during construction and operation (see Section 2.1). The shore crossing required for the proposed Project would be installed beneath Ormond Beach. With the proposed mitigation, the potential impacts of construction, operation, or an accident on terrestrial biological resources would be reduced to a level that is below the significance criteria.

COMMENTER
T005-47

T005-47.3

Section 4.11.1.6 and Impact GEO-5 in Section 4.11.4 contain additional information on liquefaction and design measures that would be implemented to avoid damage to a pipeline from liquefaction. Only natural gas would be transported in the offshore and onshore pipelines.

T005-47.1

T005-47.2

T005-47.3

1 designated as highly susceptible to liquefaction. The EIR
2 must deal with this particular hazard, common to the
3 Oxnard/Port Hueneme coastline. This fact cannot be
4 dismissed as unimportant.

T005-47.3
(cont'd)

5 All insurers raise their premiums for homeowners
6 because they regard liquefaction as eminently dangerous.
7 That danger would be increased considerably with LNG pipes.

T005-47.4

8 I have many other concerns, but that's one of the
9 many concerns that I have. That and the wetlands.

10 Thank you.

11 (Applause.)

12 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Thank you.

13 I called a number of names that no one answered
14 to, so just in case you happened to be out of the room
15 momentarily, let me read those very quickly, again, in case
16 you are still here and would like to come speak.

17 Melissa Zavala, Alicia Melendez, Leilani Costello,
18 Alan Redding, Esther Redding, Kate Crandall, Angela
19 DiGiglio, Mildred Miele, Angela Slaff, Dr. Dean, Donald
20 Wallace, Charles Dean, Tomoko Tsuji, and Doug Temple.

21 If you're here, please come up here and we'll work
22 you right in.

23 The next people will be Diane Safford. After her,
24 the next names are Jose Laza, Veronica Vasquez. This is
25 difficult to read, it looks like Aaron Papazido. Patrick,

T005-47.4

Section 4.2.5 contains information on the Applicant's insurance coverage and cost recovery for incidents. The proposed pipelines would carry natural gas, not LNG.